

1 Stephen R. Cochell  
2 Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
3 *srocochell@gmail.com*  
4 5850 San Felipe, Ste. 500  
5 Houston Texas 77057  
6 Telephone:(713) 436-8000  
7 Facsimile: (213) 623-2000

5 Allan Grant (SBN#213658)  
Grant's Law Firm  
6 17351 Greentree Drive  
Riverside, California 92503-6762  
7 Telephone (888)937-7555  
Facsimile (866)858-6637

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
9 JASON EDWARD THOMAS CARDIFF

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Case No. 5:23-CR-00021-JGB

Plaintiff.

VS

# JASON EDWARD THOMAS CARDIFF

SURETIES' MEMORANDUM IN  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR ORDER  
FORFEITING BAIL AND FOR  
SUMMARY ADJUDICATION  
OF OBLIGATION

### Defendant

And

LILIA MURPHY and BRIAN  
KENNEDY

Hearing Date: March 3, 2025

Courtroom: 1

Time: 2:00 p.m.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

L

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ii
3	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
4	DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S	
5	MOTION FOR ORDER FORFEITING BAIL AND FOR SUMMARY	
6	ADJUDICATION OF OBLIGATION .....	1
7	I. Background Facts .....	1
8	II. Rule 46(f) Does Not Require Forfeiture of Property or Funds If Justice Does	
9	Not Require Forfeiture.....	4
10	A.    Defendant's Willfulness in Breaching a Release Condition.....	5
11	B.    The Sureties Participation Apprehending Defendant .....	6
12	C.    The Cost, Inconvenience, and Prejudice Suffered By The Government..	6
13	D.    Mitigating Factors .....	6
14	E.    Whether The Surety Is A Professional Or A Member Of The	
15	Family Or Friend;.....	7
16	F.    The Appropriateness of The Bond Amount. ....	8
17	G.    The Facts Are Not Crystallized.....	9
18	III. Conclusion .....	9

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## **Case Law**

3	<i>See United States v \$8850</i> , 461 U.S. 555 (1983) .....	8
4	<i>United States v Abernathy</i> , 757 F.2d 1012 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985) .....	5
5		
6	<i>United States v. Amwest Sur. Ins. Co.</i> , 54, F.3d 601 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) .....	5
7		
8	<i>United States v Bass</i> , 573 F.2d 258 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1978).....	4
9		
10	<i>United States v. Castaldo</i> , 667 F.2d 20 (9th Cir. 1981) .....	7
11		
12	<i>United States v Gifford</i> , 423 F.Supp. 819 (C.D. Cal. 2019) .....	7
13		
14	<i>United States v. Martinez</i> ,	
15	2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 161260, (S.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2013) .....	7
16		
17	<i>United States v. Nguyen</i> , 279 F.3d 1112 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002) .....	4
18		
19	<i>United States v. Parr</i> , 594 F.2d 440 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1979) .....	5
20		
21	<i>United States v. Vaccarro</i> , 51 F.3d 189, 192 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988).....	4-5
22		
23	<i>United States v. Vickers</i> , 144 F. Supp. 3d 1146 (E.D. Cal.2015) .....	4-5

## Rules

Fed. R. Crim. P. 46 ..... *passim*

1                   **DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S**  
2                   **MOTION FOR ORDER FORFEITING BAIL AND FOR SUMMARY**  
3                   **ADJUDICATION OF OBLIGATION**

4                   Sureties Lilia Murphy and Brian Kennedy (hereinafter "Sureties"), by and  
5                   through their undersigned counsel, respectfully submit this response in opposition to  
6                   the United States' Motion for Order Forfeiting Bail and for Summary Adjudication of  
7                   Obligation (Dkt. 189). The Government seeks a forfeiture of bail and entry of  
8                   judgment in the amount of \$530,000 based on the alleged bond violation of Defendant  
9                   Jason Edward Thomas Cardiff, which would result in liability for the Sureties in the  
10                  amounts of \$500,000 (Murphy) and \$30,000 (Kennedy).

11                  For the reasons set forth below, the Sureties respectfully request that the Court  
12                  deny summary adjudication of the Bondholder's rights to seek the mitigation and  
13                  remission of the proposed forfeiture of their property under Fed. R. Crim. P. 46(f)(2).  
14                  The Bondholders request an evidentiary hearing before decision on the Government's  
15                  motion.

16                  **I.     Background Facts**

17                  On February 5, 2025, the Court granted an Order Vacating Trial Date, Tolling of  
18                  Speedy Trial Act, and Issuance of an arrest warrant. Dkt. 196. However, the Sureties  
19                  submit that entry of a judgment is not automatic and that the Court retains discretion  
20                  under Rule 46(f)(2) to set aside or remit forfeiture in whole or in part based on the  
21                  circumstances of this case.

22                  The facts of this case are unique. Mr. Cardiff was placed under arrest when he  
23                  traveled from Ireland to the United States to attend his father's funeral. Bond was  
24                  granted at \$530,000. Ms. Lilia Murphy agreed to pledge her home to secure \$500,000  
25                  of the bond as part of an appearance bond and Mr. Kennedy agreed to a \$30,000  
26                  appearance bond. The Court also provided for Stephen Cochell to have custody of  
27  
28

1 Mr. Cardiff and approved Mr. Cardiff to live with Ms. Murphy and Stephen Cochell.<sup>1</sup>  
2 Dkt. 21. The bond also set a curfew from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. daily and to wear an  
3 electronic monitoring device. Id.

4       The Court granted Mr. Cardiff leave to travel to Dublin after his wife suffered a  
5 heart attack. Dkt. 87 He stayed ten days and complied fully with the Court's order.  
6 On September 4, 2024, the Court granted Mr. Cardiff leave to visit Ireland to provide  
7 support for his wife and eleven year old daughter. Dkt. 103, 105. Mr. Cardiff's request  
8 indicated that he was going to visit a pulmonologist. Dkt. 103-1 at 5. On October 29,  
9 2024, the Court entered an Order allowing Mr Cardiff fourteen days travel to assist his  
10 wife and attend a medical appointment. Dkt. 122, 122-1. On November 15, 2025, Mr.  
11 Cardiff requested an extension of his travel because of unanticipated health problems  
12 and had scheduled an appointment with a cardiologist. Dkt. 125 at 2. He advised the  
13 Court that Dr. M.S. referred him to Blackrock Medical Centre finding him "medically  
14 unfit to fly until further notice. *Id.* Pretrial Services did not oppose the request. Dkt.  
15 125 at 3. On December 13, 2024, Defendant asked for an additional extension of travel  
16 for medical reasons. Dkt. 148. The Court granted this extension but indicated that,  
17 absent extenuating circumstances, the Court was not inclined to grant future requests  
18 to travel or extend travel. Dkt. 151.

19       From December 6, 2023 until his last departure to Ireland, Mr Cardiff was living  
20 with Ms. Murphy and counsel complying fully with the Bond with electronic  
21 monitoring, curfew and reporting to Pretrial Services. At that point, Mr. Cardiff had  
22 periodic discussions with Ms. Murphy updating her on his health condition. While  
23 living at Ms. Murphy's home, Ms. Murphy became aware that Mr. Cardiff had certain  
24 symptoms and was concerned about Mr. Cardiff's health. **Exhibit A**, Murphy Dec. ¶¶s  
25  
26

---

27       <sup>1</sup> Ms. Murphy later married Mr. Cochell. Mr. Cochell subsequently entered an  
28 appearance as counsel for Mr. Cardiff. For purposes of this case, counsel will refer to  
his wife as Ms. Murphy.

1 12-14. In or about November, 2024, Mr. Cardiff disclosed to Ms. Murphy that he had  
2 experienced additional and more severe medical problems that needed treatment. Id.  
3 at ¶ 15, 17.

4 On January 14, 2025, Defendant filed his Motion for an Order Extending  
5 International Travel, or in the Alternative to Modify the Bond. Mr. Cardiff advised the  
6 Court, and provided the Court with medical evidence that he was medically unfit to fly  
7 back to the United States. Dkt. 162. Defendant's primary physician, Dr. M.S.  
8 recommended a three-to-four-month treatment plan to assure that Mr. Cardiff could fly  
9 safely without risking even more serious health consequences. Dkt. 171 at 2. Mr.  
10 Cardiff submitted Dr. M.S.' report under seal and asked the Court to allow him to stay  
11 the additional time to protect his health. Dkt 149, 175.

12 The Court deemed the evidence submitted by Dr. M.S. to be insufficient as her  
13 report indicated that Mr. Cardiff's symptoms "could" pose a risk of serious injury and  
14 that reduced cabin pressure and lower oxygen availability at altitude would greatly  
15 increase the potential for ...complications. See Dkt. 171 at 4. On reconsideration,  
16 Defendant submitted further evidence from Dr. M.S. However, the Court held that the  
17 evidence was rejected because the email submission was not "new" evidence that could  
18 not have been submitted under L.R. 7-18. Dkt. 171 at 2.

19 Both Ms. Murphy and Mr. Kennedy were aware that Mr. Cardiff became ill while  
20 in Ireland and was granted extensions of time to seek evaluation medical treatment for  
21 his medical condition. After the Court's ruling on reconsideration, the Sureties asked  
22 Mr. Cardiff why he could not return but were told that he wanted to return but was  
23 medically unfit to travel until further treatment was obtained to avoid risk of additional  
24 injury or permanent harm to his physical health if he traveled. **Exhibit A**, Declaration  
25 of Lilia Murphy ¶¶s 16, 19 (hereafter "Murphy Dec."); **Exhibit B**, Declaration of  
26 Brian Kennedy ¶ 7 (hereafter "Kennedy Dec."). As set out below, the Bondholders  
27 respectfully submit that they should not be punished for Mr. Cardiff's decision not to  
28 return on January 19, 2025.

1  
2  
3     **II. Rule 46(f) Does Not Require Forfeiture of Property or Funds If Justice**  
4     **Does Not Require Forfeiture.**

5           It is well established that the purpose of bail bonds is to make sure defendants  
6 show up for court, not to punish them or their families if they fail to appear. *United*  
7 *States v. Vaccarro*, 51 F.3d 189, 192 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988); *United States v Bass*, 573 F.2d 258,  
8 260 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir 1978) (“The purpose of a bail bond is not punitive; it is to secure the presence  
9 of the defendant”). As set out below, this court has the discretion to set aside a forfeiture  
10 “in whole or in part” “if it otherwise appears that justice does not require the forfeiture.”

11          In *United States v. Nguyen*, 279 F.3d 1112, 1115 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002), the Court noted  
12 that “The law on bail forfeiture is neither complex nor voluminous.” F.R. Crim. P. 46  
13 provides that if there is a breach of a condition of a bond, the district court shall declare  
14 a forfeiture of the bail.” However, Rule 46 (e)(2) and (4) also provides that a district  
15 court:

16           (2) ...may direct that a forfeiture be set aside in whole or in part,  
17 upon such conditions as the court may impose, if a person  
18 released upon execution of an appearance bond with a surety is  
19 subsequently surrendered by the surety into custody or if it  
*otherwise appears that justice does not require the forfeiture....*  
20 [and]

21           (4) ...may remit it in whole or in part under the [same]  
22 conditions....

23          *Id.* (emphasis supplied)

24          The *Nguyen* court set out six non-exclusive factors that may be considered in  
25 deciding whether to set aside or remit forfeiture of the bond. These factors include:  
26 (1)The defendant’s willfulness in breaching a release condition; (2) the sureties’  
27 participation in apprehending the defendant; (3) the cost, inconvenience, and prejudice  
28 suffered by the government; (4) mitigating factors; (5) whether the surety is a  
professional or a member of the family or friend; and (6) the appropriateness of the

1 bond amount.

2       In *United States v. Vickers*, 144 F. Supp. 3d 1146, 1150 (E.D. Cal.2015), the  
3 Court noted that the purpose of the bail bond is not punitive. Rather a bond is to insure  
4 that the accused will reappear at a later time. *Id.* citing *Vaccaro*, 51 F.3d at 192. The  
5 *Vickers* court emphasized that the court must ensure that its decision remains free from  
6 frustration or vindictiveness. *Id.* citing *United States v. Parr*, 594 F.2d 440, 444 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
7 1979). In *United States v. Amwest Sur. Ins. Co.*, 54, F.3d 601, 604 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995), the  
8 Court suggested that a defendant's ultimate appearance is a ground for remittance, even  
9 if he was absent in prior proceedings.

10      **A. Defendant's Willfulness in Breaching a Release Condition**

11      In *Nguyen*, defendant was arrested at work despite consistent claims that he could  
12 not surrender himself because he was at home recuperating from surgery. *Id.* at 1116.  
13 Similarly, in *United States v Abernathy*, 757 F.2d 1012, 1015 (9<sup>th</sup> Circuit), the Court  
14 found conduct to be willful where defendant fled nearly 1500 miles using aliases.

15      In stark contrast, Defendant was granted a court order allowing him to travel to  
16 Ireland and was granted extensions to seek medical treatment. While the Court denied  
17 further extensions, Defendant was advised by his doctors that he was medically unfit to  
18 travel and that he would suffer greater injury if he returned to the United States. Dr.  
19 M.S. provided a 3-4 month treatment plan. Dkt. 175. Defendant recognized that the  
20 Court ordered his return but, at the time, concluded that if he returned without sufficient  
21 treatment, he would potentially suffer greater health consequences resulting in  
22 disability and lose his ability to support his family. Dkt 178, Defendant's Status  
23 Report. Defendant fully intends to return to the United States. Exhibit C, Declaration  
24 of Jason Cardiff ¶ 4. Dkt. 178 at 2.

25      The Court should not proceed with forfeiture of property or assets from innocent  
26 third parties unless or until it becomes clear that Defendant does not intend to return to  
27 the United States. This factor weighs in favor of the Sureties at this time.  
28

1                   **B. The Sureties Participation Apprehending Defendant**

2                   While Ms. Murphy and Mr. Kennedy are not in a position to physically  
3 apprehend Defendant. Both, however, have asked the defendant to obey the order and  
4 return to the United States. Both were essentially told that Defendant wanted to return  
5 to the United States but could not risk the health consequences. **Exhibit A**, Murphy  
6 Dec. ¶ 19, **Exhibit B**, Kennedy Dec.¶ 7. This factor favors the Sureties.

7                   **C. The Cost, Inconvenience, and Prejudice Suffered By The Government**

8                   At this point, the Government has sustained limited cost or prejudice from  
9 Defendant's absence on January 19, 2025. The cost of litigating pre-trial motions and  
10 trial is a cost that would have been incurred in any event. Moreover, there is no  
11 evidence that the Defendant intends to do anything but get treatment in Ireland and  
12 return. Defendant states he intends to return to the United States within the next three  
13 month (May, 2025). Defendant is still reporting to Pretrial Services and will continue  
14 to do so upon return. This factor potentially favors the Government, but is entitled to  
15 little weight when the failure to appear took place barely three weeks ago. This factor  
16 currently favors the Sureties.

17                   **D. Mitigating Factors**

18                   The Court held a hearing on January 30, 2025 and then filed this motion seeking  
19 forfeiture of property and funds. Ms. Murphy's home is worth more than \$500,000  
20 and was purchased by her and her late husband, Leo Murphy, before he tragically died  
21 in 2022. Exhibit A, Murphy Dec. ¶ 5. Ms. Murphy respects and obeys the law and  
22 has been a law-abiding citizen her entire life. *Id.* at ¶ 4. Ms. Murphy felt compelled to  
23 help. Because he had electronic monitoring, curfew conditions and was under  
24 supervision of Pretrial Services supervision, Ms. Murphy was confident that she and  
25 Steve Cochell would have control over the situation and be able to oversee Mr.  
26 Cardiff's bond conditions. *Id.* at ¶ 7.

27                   Ms. Murphy took Mr. Cardiff into her home and was aware that he complied  
28 with the curfew and had a decent living situation. **Exhibit A** at ¶¶s 8-9. Over the course

1 of the last fourteen months, Ms. Murphy observed that Mr. Cardiff went on business  
2 trips and returned without incident. *Id.* at 9.

3 In January, 2025, before the January 19, 2025 deadline and after the January 19,  
4 2025 deadline, Ms. Murphy told Mr. Cardiff that he needed to return to Houston and  
5 reminding him that her house would be subject to forfeiture if he did not return. **Exhibit**  
6 **A** at ¶ 19. On those occasions, Mr. Cardiff made it clear that he wanted to return but  
7 could not return to Houston unless the doctors in Ireland said he was fit to travel and  
8 further stated that he would suffer greater and potentially irreversible damage to his  
9 health if he flew before the doctors could treat him. *Id.* at ¶ 19.

10 Mr. Kennedy is a member of Redwood Scientific Technologies, Inc's Board of  
11 Directors and has had frequent contact with Mr. Cardiff in that capacity. Mr. Kennedy  
12 learned of Mr. Cardiff's health condition and urged him to return to the United States  
13 to comply with the January 19, 2025 deadline. **Exhibit B**, Kennedy Declaration ¶7.  
14 However, Mr. Cardiff told him that he would seriously jeopardize his health and  
15 believed that he needed follow doctors' orders until he was found to be fit to travel. *Id.*  
16 This factor favors the Sureties.

17 **E. Whether The Surety Is A Professional Or A Member Of The Family Or**  
18 **Friend;**

19 If the surety is a defendant's family member or friend, rather than a professional  
20 bondsman, this factor weighs in favor of setting aside the bond forfeiture." *United*  
21 *States v Gifford*, 423 F.Supp. 819, (C.D. Cal. 2019); *United States v. Martinez*, 2013  
22 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 161260, 2013 WL 6002441, at \*7 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2013). See  
23 also *United States v. Castaldo*, 667 F.2d 20, 21 (9th Cir. 1981) (explaining that  
24 professional bondsmen are "experienced at bonding criminal defendants" and more  
25 likely to be "aware of the risks of executing and filing a bond on [the defendant's]  
26 behalf."). Ms. Murphy was a friend and not a professional bondsman. As such, this  
27 factor favors setting aside the bond forfeiture.

1                   **F. The Appropriateness of The Bond Amount.**

2                   This factor addresses whether the bond amount was reasonable at the time of its  
3 issuance. At the time of the initial bond hearing, the Government argued that Mr.  
4 Cardiff fled to Ireland to avoid prosecution notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Cardiff  
5 made no secret of his intention to move to Ireland and, in compliance with the FTC  
6 order, gave notice to the FTC that he was moving to Dublin and later updates his  
7 address.<sup>2</sup> **Exhibit C**, Declaration of Jason Cardiff ¶¶s 4-5. The argument that Mr.  
8 Cardiff fled to Ireland likely resulted in a substantial increase in the bond and the  
9 Court's determination that it needed real property as security for his bond. The Sureties  
10 believe that the bond amount should be remitted to account for this misrepresentation by  
11 Government counsel.

12                  The reasonableness of the bond should also be evaluated in light of motions that  
13 seek dismissal of part or all of the indictment based on Supreme Court precedent. In  
14 sum, the bond should have been lower where, as here, the indictment was either vague  
15 or substantively defective. Pending before the Court are four motions that impact a  
16 determination of whether the bond was reasonable<sup>3</sup>: (a) Defendant's Motion to Dismiss  
17 Count Two of the Indictment (Dubin) Dkt 106; (b) Motion to Suppress Evidence (Dkt.  
18 115); (c) Motion to Dismiss Counts 3 and 4 (Aguilar) Dkt. 134; and (d) Motion to  
19 Dismiss Based on Double Jeopardy (Dkt. 135).

20                  In the context of this case, due process requires that the Court rule on these  
21 motions *before* determining bond forfeiture. *See United States v \$8850*, 461 U.S. 555,  
22 564 (1983) (Due process is flexible regarding the right to be heard at a meaningful time  
23 recognizing that the timing of a proceeding may impair a party's ability to defend the  
24

---

25                  <sup>2</sup> Counsel has ordered the transcript of the hearing to eliminate any doubt as to what  
26 was said at the bond hearing.

27                  <sup>3</sup> Sureties recognize that the Court indicated that it would issue decisions on the  
28 pretrial motions at the January 30, 2025 hearing. Dkt. 198.

1 propriety of a forfeiture).

2       **G. The Facts Are Not Crystallized.**

3           As a practical matter, the facts are not set in stone and may change. While the  
4 Government may take some satisfaction if they obtain an order forfeiting Ms. Murphy's  
5 property and Mr. Kennedy's funds, Mr. Cardiff may be released to travel by his  
6 physicians as they treat his condition. At that point, the Court and the sureties will  
7 have expended a lot of time and resources on this issue and the Court will have to re-  
8 evaluate its rulings on the bond. Ms. Murphy should not be subjected to the emotional  
9 stress of losing her house where, as here, the facts may change within the next several  
10 months. The Government will not suffer prejudice if the Court defers ruling on its  
11 motion.

12       **III. Conclusion**

13           Rule 46(f) provides that the Court may set aside in whole or in part a bail  
14 forfeiture if appears that justice does not require bail forfeiture. In sum, neither Ms.  
15 Murphy nor Mr. Kennedy have first-hand knowledge of Mr. Cardiff's medical  
16 condition and are not in a position to apprehend him. Both have asked Mr. Cardiff to  
17 return to Houston and were told that he wanted to return but his doctors found him  
18 medically unfit to travel and would suffer additional harm if he traveled before he  
19 completed treatment. The Government is well aware of Mr. Cardiff's explanation for  
20 not appearing at the January 30, 2025 hearing and that he intends to surrender as soon  
21 as possible, presumably within the next three months when his treatment is concluded.  
22 Dkt. 178. The Court vacated the pretrial conference and trial dates.<sup>4</sup> Dkt. 196.

23           Based on the *Nguyen* factors, "justice does not require the forfeiture" of Ms.

24  
25       

---

26       <sup>4</sup> Barely three days after the January 30, 2025 hearing, the Government filed its Motion  
27 to Forfeit Property. Dkt 189. The rush to secure a judgment and start executing on the  
Sureties' property and assets appears calculated to punish people who are friendly with  
Mr. Cardiff---not to secure his appearance.

28

1 Murphy's home and Mr. Kennedy's funds. In that vein, Sureties respectfully submit  
2 that the process can be deferred or stayed for several months until Mr. Cardiff either  
3 surrenders himself or does not. At that time, the Court will have more information and  
4 be in a better position to render a decision that is fair to the Sureties.

5 **Dated:** February 10, 2024

6 **Respectfully submitted,**  
7

9  
10 By: /s/ Stephen R. Cochell  
Stephen R. Cochell

11  
12 Attorney for Defendant  
13 JASON EDWARD THOMAS CARDIFF

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

